

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session**  
**Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ**  
**Thursday, January 16, 2014 - 3:30 p.m.**

**1. Verification of Notice**

Chair Losoff verified the work session had been properly noticed.

**2. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call**

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present:** Chair Marty Losoff and Commissioners Eric Brandt, John Curriuan, Scott Jablow, Kathy Levin and Norm Taylor. Vice Chair Michael Hadley was excused.

**Staff Present:** Lauren Browne, Andy Dickey, Audree Juhlin, Cari Meyer, David Peck, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey

**Council Liaison:** Councilor Mike Ward

**3. Commission & Staff Announcements**

*There were no announcements.*

**4. Summary of Current Events by Commissioners & Staff**

*There were no current events discussed.*

**5. PUBLIC FORUM: For items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public**

*Chair Losoff opened the public forum, and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.*

**6. Regular Business**

**a. Discussion regarding the City's newly implemented Citizen Engagement Program. Staff: Lauren Browne, Citizen Engagement Coordinator (30 minutes, 3:45 pm—4:15 pm)**

Chair Losoff introduced the agenda item, and Lauren Browne presented an overview of the Citizen Engagement Program and explained that it starts with ideas collected from residents, and there would be one of three courses of action. 1) The idea will be immediately addressed by staff, 2) The idea will be put on the City Council's agenda as soon as possible, or 3) Big picture ideas will be discussed by the Council at their annual priority-setting meeting. Public input will be gathered through task forces or work groups that will work as an advisory board, acting as the voice of the citizens and working side-by-side with staff. A current work group is the Bike Park work group that includes bike shop owners, the Verde Valley Cyclists Coalition and Doug Copp is the Bicycle Coordinator at the City, and they meet about twice a month.

To help with the overarching ideas, there will be a Citizens Budget Committee, which will meet every year. They will sit with the City Council and departments to review the budget, and there will be Community Plan advisory groups that will be like the Community Plan police by referencing the Community Plan and ensuring that recommendations are put before the City Council as to how to bring the Plan to fruition.

New strategies play off of citizens' usage of the Web and Smartphones and one idea could be to use web-based polling for members who can't make it to work groups, etc. We have a comment box on the website, so ideas can be relayed to her. There will also be a Citizen Response Program that is geared toward Public Works and safety with the use of Smartphones. Additionally, she started an Instagram and Twitter page to try to get the younger demographic.

If Commissioners want to get involved they can go to the Citizen Engagement icon at the bottom of the City's webpage to go to a questionnaire for volunteers to identify the categories of interest. Thirty people have signed up so far and she will have a bank of people to draw from.

#### **Commission Questions and Comments:**

The Commissioners discussed the following topics:

- Whether or not ideas that staff will act on still have to go to the City Council.
- Ideas that are "non-starters" still going to the City Council, although people can be asked to elaborate on their ideas and get some additional support or people involved to bring in something more substantial, before taking it forward.
- The increase in the number of people on the list is a great improvement.
- Regarding other work groups, one is forming the Mayor's Arts Awards and there is the Uptown Parking group.
- Getting the younger people involved is great.

- b. **PZ 13-00014 (ZC, DEV) Discussion regarding a request for a Zone Change from CF (Community Facility) to L (Lodging) and Development Review approval to construct 40 new lodging units, a new meeting facility, and associated site improvements at 1105 Airport Road. A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the area west of the intersection of Airport Road and Air Terminal Drive on top of Airport Mesa. The lot is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 408-27-001. Applicant: Sky Ranch Operations, LLC; PO Box 2579; Sedona, AZ; Agent: Design Group Architects; 376 Jordan Road; Sedona, AZ; Staff: Cari Meyer, Associate Planner (1 hour; 4:15 pm—5:15pm)**

Chair Losoff introduced the agenda item, explained the purpose of the work session and invited Mike Bower and Max Licher to join the Commission at the table.

Cari Meyer provided lighting information that didn't get into the packet and provided an overview of the history of this request. Cari explained that this is the introductory work session in the final review phase and noted that staff met with the applicant this morning and provided comments from reviewing agencies. The public hearing is tentatively scheduled for February 18th; however, another work session can be scheduled.

Cari explained that initially the possibility of having a public hearing on February 4th was mentioned, but with the nature of some of the initial comments received, it was decided to put it on the February 18th agenda to provide adequate time to address everything. If another work session is needed, it would be on February 13th.

#### **Commission Questions and Comments:**

- It is a Zone Change and a Development Review, so the Commission can get into things that don't affect a Zone Change.

Cari explained that the request for unit counts hasn't changed; there are 94 existing and they are asking for 40 new units and a meeting facility with the site improvements discussed at the previous meetings, such as new parking areas, a new wastewater treatment facility for the entire development, a new pool, a wedding lawn and a service maintenance yard, in three separate phases of development. Cari then discussed the Community Plan Amendment

regarding the lodging use and support for non-aeronautical uses, etc., and the proposed package of community benefits.

Cari also reviewed the site plan and indicated that at this time staff has not requested any additional information to evaluate compliance with Article 9 of the Land Development Code, but staff will also be evaluating it for compliance with the Design Review Manual. Cari then reviewed the elevations and landscaping plan proposed, and the trail that was built in partnership with the U.S. Forest Service. Cari reported that Traffic and Wastewater Reports have been provided and reviewed by Public Works, and Yavapai County reviewed the Wastewater Report and agreed with the findings. She then indicated that they had no attendees at their open house, so they will prepare a short participation report on their outreach. Cari added that most of the comments from the reviewing agencies were comments regarding requirements that would be required before issuance of a permit, and there were no major changes required at this time.

**Additional Commission Questions and Comments:**

- Question about the type of requirements, and Cari explained some of the requirements included fire hydrants and a fire alarm system, a permit for the pool, etc., and Andy Dickey confirmed that Engineering checked for any inaccuracies; however, Cari indicated that Community & Economic Development hadn't reviewed it in depth.

Max Licher indicated that they received the Engineering Department's comments and forwarded them to Shepherd-Wesnitzer and most of the issues were addressed, but they did find some inaccuracies. There were mistakes made in the writing part, but the numbers and the level of service analysis were correct; however, they weren't updated in the text, so Shepherd-Wesnitzer is revising the Traffic Impact Analysis and we should have a revised version next week.

- Question about the time period chosen for the traffic study, and Max Licher explained that was when they could schedule it, and it is a good representation of a maximum use period and a peak p.m. traffic hour that coincides with sunset. If you were going to go for an average time, you would reduce rather than increase the numbers taken at that time.
- Concern about November being the 3rd lowest period of the year for lodging occupancy, while February, March and April are the highest time.
- Comment about mixing vista traffic with normal traffic at other times
- Concern about how the bad weather may have impacted the traffic in November; however, Max explained that we had really good weather at that time. Andy Dickey added that staff can look through the city's traffic data to see what the counts suggest throughout the year.
- Request for data on how the traffic fluctuates on Airport Road throughout the year.
- Concern that we have the Zone Change and Design Review on this project, and we discuss traffic impact, but we have to look at this project as a project; however, there are two Zone Changes upcoming up on Airport Road, this one and CVS, and that could have an impact on traffic as well. Cari explained that we have to evaluate this project.
- Question as to whether or not the Commission can act in a vacuum; it would be nice for the Engineers to find out if they are doing the same report for CVS, because it would be important to have some idea of what is being talked about.
- Comment that this project is on the table now, so move ahead with this project and the other project is an unknown. When it comes down the pipe, they have to evaluate it in view of this one being approved.
- Comment that if there are two projects that together would put traffic over the limit, then there is kind of a race to see who gets to the Commission first, if you look at each one in a vacuum, but there is a certain unfairness in holding the applicant for this project responsible for what is happening on another project that may never get approved. David Peck explained that the concern for this project is the portion of Airport Road that goes up the

hillside, not the intersection, because that has plenty of capacity and CVS traffic isn't going to drive up and down the road to Sky Ranch Lodge.

- Comment that a previous concern was about traffic making a left turn into CVS across the traffic backed up coming down the hill from the vortex; however, that would not be a factor of the Sky Ranch Lodge project.

Andy Dickey explained that when the Galloway project came through a turn lane was added, and that likely is what this would be looking at in terms of if another lane needs to be added, and it has already be upgraded, so he doesn't see another lane on top of that.

- Comment that there is nothing that can be done about the vacuum issue today, but the big picture is something the Commission needs to look at from an overall planning point of view, although by law each project needs to be looked at individually.
- Question about the omission of data for 2012 and 2013, and staff pointed out that it is addressed in comment #1 where it says, "Please update report using 3-year accident data from January 1, 2011 - December 31, 2013. Max Licher added that Shepherd-Wesnitzer just got that this morning. Additionally, Audree Juhlin noted that she sent a report from the Police Chief for the past two years -- one year had 3 accidents and the other year had 5 accidents.
- Concern that the data showed no accidents, but on the most recent dates, there were substantial accidents and as the City gets more populated, updated information is vital. It was noted that there were four accidents in 2012 and three in 2013 and the concern was the injuries, not no accidents. It is unclear if the injuries occurred on Airport Road itself or at the intersection.
- Concern about what injuries could occur if there are that many more people traveling down Airport Road, and Andy Dickey explained that you need to consider the type of accident.
- Question about the number of injuries and accidents and if those numbers would skew the results, as far as what is safe for that roadway. Andy Dickey explained it depends on what they are and the details, so staff will look at that.

Mike Bower indicated that the reason to discuss it is if there is something you want the applicant to do, from going away to doing nothing, and without even knowing the numbers, it should be prudent to bring up what you want them to do if you assume problems. The response was just that the proper data is needed to form a good decision; it is a great project, but if some information isn't correct, staff can't make an informed decision, and why there are some small inconsistencies is important. There is a need to be sure all the facts are there and we can move forward, and if something needs to be discussed like widening the road at 89A, going for a turning lane, etc., or if there are some suggestions, the factual data is needed.

- Question as to if there is information in the report about the roadway width that is not accurate, would it skew staff's information or numbers. David Peck explained that they are actually showing it a little narrower than what it is, so . . .
- Comment that after measuring it, they are saying it is 24' in some places when it is 22', and in some places they say it is 20' or 21' and it is 19' and 18'. David Peck indicated that their factors are never on anything less than 20'.

Max Licher indicated that their understanding is that Shepherd-Wesnitzer used the 20' narrowest width that they measured and that staff is agreeing with, and that was applied to the whole road, and 20' wide, 10' travel lane, no shoulder, 6% grade, etc. gave them the roadway capacity.

- Comment that the report said 24' and David Peck indicated that one of his comments addresses that, and they have already indicated that they are using two 10' lanes.

- Question about how the phasing affects the contributions in the preliminary comments, and staff explained that everything will be done in Phase I, except the lodging units and the parking and landscaping associated with those lodging units. The contribution to the airport is somewhat dependent upon the airport's timing, the contribution to the U.S. Forest Service has been made and the affordable housing will be done in Phase I. The art in public places has to be done pre-Certificate of Occupancy based on square footage, unless they do something approved in lieu of, although something could be approved ahead of time for Phases II and III, if it is approved for the entire project.
- Question as to when the shuttle van becomes available, and Max Licher confirmed the intent is with the first two phases. Staff added that is a question that can be asked of Sky Ranch and Max agreed that would be identified in the Development Agreement, but the understanding is once they have the meeting facility running and more units.
- It was recalled that the Commission was told by the applicant that most of the project will be accomplished in Phases I and II.
- Asked if the Terms of Use for the meeting facility are compatible with those offered by existing hotels and Max indicated they don't know; it was generated by Sky Ranch and would be finalized in the Development Agreement. Mike Bower guessed that other hotels don't have anything in perpetuity; however, it was noted that there was free and for fee, and the question was if this is in the ballpark. Mike indicated that they think it exceeds what is offered.
- A request was made for a representation that it meets or exceeds; is it for a fee, but forgiven for non-profits, but not for profits, etc.
- Question as to if the zoning approval for the 40 units requires that they be built within a defined timeframe, because Phase III is between years three and ten. Cari explained that if it is a conditioned Zone Change tied to a development plan, it has to be tied in and developed, and that is why they have proposed the phasing, so they can ensure they don't lose their ability to build them. It was also noted that there was discussion of saying it was not to exceed 10 years or 5 years, etc., as part of the conditions.
- Regarding the Letter of Intent dated December 11th, on page 2, it says that the wastewater treatment plant will occur in Phase I, so does that mean that the building will be built in Phase I, but some expansion of capacity will be in steps? Max Licher explained it isn't a building; it is a fenced yard with mostly buried equipment, so the plant part will be built, and then modules can be added as needed. Mike Bower explained that the actual treatment tank and plant consists of two parts and, technically, since you can add filter modules at any time, some of them would not be added until the third phase.
- A request was made for the architects to make a note of some of clarifications.
- Regarding the statement that all buildings would be one-story, there is mention of a two-story lodge. Mike Bower agreed that is a mistake on their part.
- Concern that on page 3, it seems like the number of trees preserved is being scaled back; originally it was 85% and now it is saying approximately three-quarters; will there be a further trend in that direction? Max Licher explained that is based on going through the engineering grading and drainage, and there shouldn't be a further trend, but that is the point of doing preliminary grading and drainage, etc., at this point.
- Comment that the next time, the Commission will need a good number; however, Mike Bower explained that by asking for preliminary grading and drainage, it gets them to a good number, although stuff happens when you go into construction and you may lose another tree. The salient issue is if we are close to being illegal, and the concern for a tree or two would be critical if they were on the verge of being in violation of the ordinance, but they are fine. Max Licher added that they are going to be adding lots of trees too. Cari pointed out that the ordinance only permits removal of trees within a building footprint, and this is conceptual. When they come back for building permits, it will be reviewed.
- Comment that the issue is what is going to be taken away, and the Commission should have that information for the next meeting. One of the positives for this project was that the trees would help block the view of the buildings from the road. Max Licher explained that those trees are in place; it is the grading around the buildings and parking layout, etc. They

aren't going to change the numbers; the only time that number will change is in a minor way once construction is underway.

- Question regarding the discussion of circulation on page 6 in paragraph 9.2, about placing lodging within walking distances of services being a good thing, one service is air travel, so is it expected that people will fly in for meetings? Mike Bower stated not based on their business plan; they are shooting for a level of conference that isn't the real high-end, so if there is any, it might be like when John McCain came here.
- Question about if it is going to increase the air traffic over Sedona, and Mike Bower indicated that it is hard to determine, but nobody thinks it will, although they do have some clientele who come in on planes, but it isn't a significant portion of their traffic.
- Question regarding page 10 where it says Sky Ranch Lodge is committed to helping the Airport Authority make improvements and Sky Ranch Lodge has earmarked \$50,000 for infrastructure improvements, and the question is what the commitment is and if it will be in the Development Agreement. Cari pointed out that there is a letter from the airport in the packet acknowledging an agreement with Sky Ranch.
- Question about if that is a binding agreement now, since it is listed as a benefit. Staff indicated that it can be ensured that is done and there will be a Development Agreement; however, that is between Sky Ranch and the airport, not Sky Ranch and the City.
- Question about the \$16,000 contribution for the public art project being reduced to \$12,600, and Cari explained that the requirement is based on the square footage. Mike Bower added that it is a formula and they had factored it themselves earlier, when they didn't have their square footage finalized, but now they have actual square footage and called staff to calculate it.
- Comment regarding improving existing signage on page 12, and when looking at the CVS footprint and the existing sign, the Commission was told that sign would have to come out and the point is to ensure Sky Ranch Lodge doesn't pay to improve signage that would have to be removed, so there needs to be some coordination. It was noted that CVS said they would work with Sky Ranch to see what could be done.

Audree Juhlin explained that if the sign is moved, it will have to conform to the non-conforming code in the Land Development Code or if it has to be brought up to current standards, it can't be off-premise at that location, so if CVS chooses not to keep it in that location, then it can't exist there in the future. Mike Bower added that they are aware of that.

- Suggestion that the first Letter of Intent for future projects be a draft that is updated based on observations, etc.
- Question about the basis for the number of parking spaces for the meeting facility, and Mike Bower explained that the code is one space for 175 sq. ft., of gross square footage, which takes the restrooms, hallway, etc., into account.
- Concern about the indication that 50% of the people would come from hotel rooms and 50% from the town, but 100% could come from the town and if there is sufficient parking for that. It was noted that the traffic analysis is best guess assumptions, so it won't be perfect. Cari pointed out that they provided parking based on the units and the meeting facility, and they haven't asked for any reduction for shared parking uses, which they could.
- Comment regarding the design of the parking lot where you leave the circle from of the meeting facility, it seems that people backing out will be in a dangerous place, and it might be wise to modify the design to not have any parking there. Cari explained that the parking lots meet the code requirements for widths and backing areas, and where two driveways intersect, there has to be a visibility triangle, so landscaping may be limited.
- Comment that although it may be a concern, if it meets the code, it meets the code. Andy Dickey pointed out that the speed is very low in parking lot situations; however, it was explained that the concern is lack of visibility.
- Suggestion to connect the new trail from the vortex to the overlook on the opposite side of the trail system that is in the canyon, because people wanting to hike don't want to walk to

the vortex and back over to get there, the distance to those trails isn't very great, and it might only cost \$4,000. Max Licher explained that there were discussions with the U.S. Forest Service about that connection from the vista to that trail, and that is a future thing that the U.S. Forest Service will do to make a loop.

- Question about the new cottages being wood, and Mike Bower indicated that they will look like wood; wood siding is in there, but stained wood siding longevity, green building and using more trees; a lot of the things that look like wood siding are actually fabricated cement board, and they would like in the Development Review to have the ability to have the look and color with the freedom to choose some different sidings. Cement board siding is more money than wood, but it is prudent if there is money to do it.
- Suggestion of another possibility is that the wood on the north side may remain good, but wood on the south side may need to be repeatedly treated or painted.
- Comment that in the formal hearing the Commission will be presented with the materials for review. Mike Bower explained that the material board has already been presented.
- Comment that the big picture or Community Plan Amendment has evolved nicely in the presentation for the Zone Change and it is going in the right direction.
- Comment about being pleased to see the letter earmarking the funds to have a sidewalk that goes from the overlook to the existing restaurant, and in the final plan, it could be incorporated to show where it goes and an additional upper level walkway. Mike Bower explained that a drawing has been submitted to show that connection.
- Comment that a major issue is the Zone Change and the community benefits are provided to mitigate the impact of a Zone Change, and this was discussed last time, but in looking at page 5-32, it lists the various benefits to consider.
- Request for the Commissioners to look at the following paragraph and ask these questions when this comes up for approval; what is the priority or benefit or need, can the benefit or need be quantified and does one outweigh the other, can a specific need be met with other alternatives, are there differences in the timeframe, and does the proposal have tax benefits that more than offset the net impacts?
- Comment that there isn't a strict set of standards to say if a benefit is a benefit or not, but those are questions the Commissioners have to ask themselves, and it is important to analyze those. It is fine to say there is going to be an increase in the tax base, but if it is taking business from another establishment, there is no net increase, and there have been comments from various restaurants and hotels, one that does wedding venues, about how much business they may lose, so the question is if there enough of tax revenue coming in to offset somebody else's.

Mike Raber explained that the context in which those questions were developed was for Special Planning Areas; this is not one of those, but it is something you can refer to as examples; however, you need to understand it is not a standard or something that is specific to this area. These are examples of some of the benefits that you can look at; they weren't written for this particular site. It was pointed out that the applicant referenced these as their take on community benefits, so the response is in kind.

Mike Bower referenced the tax benefit question and explained that they were attacked by some other hotels, when they started this process for the land use change, with a lot of lobbying to kill it, and the contention was that Sky Ranch had an unfair advantage, but they showed that the other hotels really had an advantage and Sky Ranch has paid more to the County per year than the other hotels, and there is limited benefit to the City, because there is a limited pie of people coming, but the meeting room is based on creating a new demographic for longer-stay visitors, and there is a certain market that avoids Sedona, because the room rates are too high, and that market is government entities and different kinds of conferences.

Mike Bower added that staff provided him with all of the Rouge's information on community benefits, and they had said they would shower tax money on the City, and they estimated

\$500,000 in increased tax benefit per year, and this project is estimating about \$135,000. It was pointed out that P&Z didn't approve that, but Council overrode the decision. Mike Bower indicated that he hoped the Commission would look at it and the robbing Peter to pay Paul is an argument that has been proffered by competitors and they don't feel it has a lot of traction behind it; they have looked into it heavily.

- Comment that the pathway and bicycle links are very good; some other things are indirect and may benefit Sky Ranch Lodge more than the community, but we have to look at these things for the future meeting.
- Request for a brief comparison and it was explained that the plan is to have a joint meeting with the Commission and Council to discuss community benefits and what the Council sees as a range of community benefits.

Mike Bower referenced an earlier statement about needing benefits to offset the net impacts, so the operative thing is to determine the impacts, and he hasn't heard any determination of implied negative impacts, and it is not meaning if they are all positive. The starting point is what are the negative impacts? They have been waiting and they need to know if there are enough benefits on the table. Max Licher agreed that he thought the point of the meeting was to not wait to the hearing to discuss benefits, because in the interim, the clients may start working on the Development Agreement, etc., so they would like that feedback now. The work session a few days before the hearing isn't a meaningful timeframe for that level of feedback.

- Comment that it is correct that they didn't hear any negative impacts; they heard about traffic and a couple of other issues, but they weren't necessarily negative impacts at this point, unless the traffic study brings up some issues. In terms of benefits, the Commission hasn't really gone through that, so do you want to go through that now?

Mike Bower indicated that they were more concerned with the initial starting point of identifying negative impacts, so they would know if there was anything to offset. He is hearing that there aren't any per se, so the benefits offered are a bonus, and to pick them apart doesn't feel quite right. If some need to be beefed up or the traffic implies a widening of the road, then that is what they need to hear, but even assuming the worst case from the traffic, they still have everybody saying it is still okay, because the road is only at 28% capacity, etc. It seems we are just spending a lot of time talking about traffic and not necessarily within the purview of a Zone Change and what they have to really deal with, although it sounds like there is something coming to them and they are going to be asked to build an alternative route onto the mesa, etc.

Max Licher reminded everyone about the Development Impact Fees and explained that for this location about 90% of the Development Impact Fees goes to Public Works and roads, while 10% goes to Police and that is determined by a formula. Sky Ranch will be contributing over \$100,000 to the City to deal with roads, so if you would like to see a pedestrian crossing at the vortex or additional signage, etc., there is already that much money being contributed for those specific purposes.

- Comment that that is not robbing Peter to pay Paul; that is a net increase.
- Question about the road being a City or County road, and Andy Dickey indicated that there are some issues with that, and the City is talking with the County, at the direction of Council, about the possibility of the upper portion being maintained by the County, so that ownership is being looked at.
- Question about the ownership of the land up there, and Andy Dickey indicated that it is their jurisdiction in that area, but the intent was to turn that portion of the road back to the City, like a narrow strip within their jurisdiction. The County owns the land and the primary reason for the road is the airport, so it seems that the County should rebuild the road.



- Comment that about six of the twelve or thirteen benefits listed are tangible, so there are probably more than needed in there.

**7. Future meeting dates and agenda items**

**a. Discussion/Possible action regarding future meeting dates and agenda items:**

**Tuesday, January 21, 2014, 5:30 pm (Regular Meeting)**

**Thursday, January 30, 2014, 3:30 pm (Work Session)**

**Tuesday, February 4, 2014 5:30 pm (Regular Meeting)**

**Thursday, February 13, 2014, 3:30 pm (Work Session)**

Commission and staff determined that the meetings on the 21st and the 30th are canceled. On Tuesday, February 4th, there will be a discussion on the draft Capital Improvement Program. Chair Losoff requested that the Commission's Work Plan and a project update also be added to that meeting. Thursday, February 13th, will be a discussion about Commission Roles & Responsibilities as part of a four-hour annual retreat from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., so staff needs to know if that time will work.

The following Tuesday will include public hearings for Sky Ranch, a CUP renewal for Enterprise Rent-A-Car, and a Time Extension for the C-Market Development Review, and staff doesn't see the need for a work session on the CUP and Time Extension. The Chair indicated the question is about a work session on Sky Ranch Lodge. Two Commissioners indicated that a work session might benefit the applicant. Max Licher indicated that they will provide a revised TIA next week. One suggestion was to add this project to the first hour of the retreat; however, there was a feeling that the 13th should be just for the retreat. It was then decided to add it to the February 4th meeting and possibly start at 4:30 p.m. The applicant indicated that after reviewing the revised TIA, they would want to know if there are any concerns and any feedback about the benefits that could affect the negotiation of the Development Agreement.

Staff then recapped the schedule discussed above and the addition of Sky Ranch on February 4th, and the Commission agreed there is no need for a work session on the CUP and Time Extension. The Commission also indicated that 1:00 p.m. would be good for the retreat. Audree Juhlin requested that any specific items or site visits that the Commissioners would like to discuss in the retreat, please email the ideas to her.

**8. Executive Session**

**If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:**

**a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).**

**b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.**

*There was no Executive Session.*

**9. Adjournment**

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 5:23 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on January 16, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date